

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

2008 JUL 30 AM 9: 27

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☒ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED DATE: 7/25/2008
DEPUTY

CASE NO.: 08cv0485 BTM (JMA) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner

CASE TITLE: Dunn v. Clark

DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Petitioner's Pleading to the Attorney General's Motion to Dismiss

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER:	No proof of service. Petitioner must serve a copy of any filing on the Attorney General's office.

Date forwarded: 7/28/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED, and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Adler

Dated: 7/28/2008
cc: All Parties

By: HAH

Phillip W. Dunn, T-79951, ASU-1286
C.SATF + STATE PRISON

P.O. BOX 7100

CORCORAN, CA 93212

REJECTED

IN The United States DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Phillip W. Dunn,
Petitioner,

v.

Ken Clark, Warden,

Respondent.

08-0485 BTM (JMA)

Petitioners pleading to
The Attorney General's
MOTION to Dismiss

The Honorable Judge J. Adler

INTRODUCTION

I AM CURRENTLY IN THE ASU AT C.SATF + STATE PRISON. I AM AND HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO MAJOR RETALIATION BY THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT AND OTHER STAFF. A LYN K. BURSON LIED TO PUT ME IN THIS SITUATION! THIS HAS PLACED A GREAT HARDSHIP ON ME. AS I DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO CERTAIN THINGS I NEED, BOTH LEGALLY AND MEDICALLY SPEAKING. I WOULD ASK THE COURT TO UNDERSTAND THE ADVERSE CONDITIONS FROM WHICH I AM PLEADING. THIS WILL BE A LOGICAL LEGAL ARGUMENT AS OPPOSED TO A LENGTHY POINTS AND AUTHORITIES DEBATE. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE (AG) IS WELL AWARE OF MY PROBLEMS WITH THE MEDICAL SYSTEM. AS THEY HAVE BEEN CONTACTED MANY TIMES TO RESOLVE